Application No.: 10/588,453

Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2010

REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1-14 remain pending in the above-

identified application, with claims 8-14 standing ready for further action on the merits, and

remaining claims 1-7 being withdrawn from consideration based on an earlier restriction

requirement of the Examiner.

Status of the Claims

In this response, claim 8 has been amended to recite "an average pore size of from 0.8 to

20 nm 0.8 to 5 nm" (emphasis added). The basis for supporting the amendment to the upper

limitation can be found at paragraphs [0118], [0131], [0139], [0194], [0237] and [0260] of the

specification. In view of the amendment in connection with the average pore size of the claimed

porous silica, the claimed invention is further defined over the cited reference, as explained

below.

The present amendments to the claims do not introduce new matter into the application

as originally filed. As such entry of the instant amendment and favorable action on the merits is

earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In the Office Action of December 22, 2010, claims 8-11 and 13 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

obvious over JP '086 (JP 2001-179086). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

obvious over JP '086.

Docket No.: 1422-0722PUS1

Page 6 of 9

 Application No.: 10/588,453
 Docket No.: 1422-0722PUS1

 Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2010
 Page 7 of 9

Applicants filed a response to the Office Action on March 22, 2011, where the claims are

amended and the remarks are provided to submit that the present invention is neither anticipated

by nor obvious over JP '086.

In this regard, it is alleged in an Advisory Action of April 6, 2011 that JP '086 discloses

the recording sheet and this disclosure can be considered as materials for various uses recited in

claim 8 of this application.

However, in view of the amendment to claim 8 regarding the average pore size of the

claimed porous silica, the claimed invention is further defined over JP '086. The recording sheet

of JP '086 employs meso porous silica having an average pore size of 10-35 nm. Further, JP

'086 teaches that in case of using porous silica having an average pore size of less than 10 nm,

property of lightfastness is inferior and optical density of ink is low, and thus, such porous silica

is not suitable for the recording sheet (see Comparative Example 1 (average pore size: 7 nm) and

Table 2). In other words, JP '086 teaches away from employing silica having such a smaller

pore size such as less than 10 nm.

On the other hand, in the present invention, as recited in claim 8, an average pore size of

the claimed porous silica is $\underline{0.8-5}$ nm, which is smaller than that of meso porous silica of JP '086

(i.e., 10-35 nm). In the present invention, this average pore size is quite suitable for adsorbing

moisture in the claimed material as recited in claim 8. JP '086 teaches away from employing

porous silica having such a small pore size, as explained above.

Therefore, the present invention is not anticipated by JP '086. Further, there is no

rationale and/or reasonable expectation of success based on JP '086, by which one skilled in the

art could arrive at the present invention as claimed, since i) JP '086 fails to disclose or suggest

 Application No.: 10/588,453
 Docket No.: 1422-0722PUS1

 Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2010
 Page 8 of 9

each of the instantly claimed features, and ii) JP '086 teaches away from the claimed invention, as explained above. Thus, it is submitted that the present invention is not obvious over JP '086.

Based on the foregoing considerations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

Docket No.: 1422-0722PUS1 Application No.: 10/588,453 Page 9 of 9

Reply to Office Action of December 22, 2010

Conclusion

Based upon the amendments and remarks presented herein, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to issue a Notice of Allowance clearly indicating that each of the pending claims is

allowed.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Toyohiko Konno, Reg. No. L0053

at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to

expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to

charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

MAY 2 0 2011 Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald M. Murphy, Jr.

Registration No.: 28977

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP 8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747 703-205-8000